

A N
Impartial Account
OF THE
Portsmouth Disputation.

By { *Samuel Chandler,*
William Leigh,
Benjamin Robinson.

Published for the Benefit of ALL,
PARTICULARLY
For the Undeceiving of Those, who
have been so basely Imposed upon, by
the [*Pretendedly*] True Narrative of
Dr. *William Russel.*

E X N O R.
LIBRARY OF THE
UNION
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Printed by *Sam. Barker* and *Sam. Farley*, for
Philip Bishop, at the Sign of the Bible
in the *Forestreet.* 1699.



Impartial Account

OF THE

Portsmouth Disputation.

MR. Chandler appeals to Major General Earl, Colonel John Gibson, and Henry Seager, Esq; Mayor of Portsmouth, for the Truth and Impartiality of this Account, each of them being present.

Several Anabaptists (on Dec. 21. 1698.) challenged the Lecturer, who was then in his Meeting-place, discoursing on Infant-baptism, and answering such Objections as are want to be urged against it, for preaching Doctrines false and untrue; and desired a publick Dispute about it, which was accepted: and according to appointment both Parties met.

And Mr. Chandler Opened with a short Speech, desiring that all things might be managed with the greatest fairness and calmness; and that they might debate of these matters as Christians; that nothing might be after a tumultuous and disorderly manner: concluding with this request, That God would grant Truth might prevail. And thus began,

Chandler. The Questions to be disputed of are these in order:

I. Whether according to the Commission of our Lord Jesus Christ, adult Believers only are the proper Subjects of Baptism, or their Infants also?

II. Whether this Ordinance of Baptism, as appointed by Christ, be to be administred by Dipping, Plunging, Overwhelming, only, and not otherwise? We deny, and they affirm.

After a few preliminary Questions, it was urg'd by *Russel.* Arg 1. Infants are not according to Christ's commission, the proper Subjects of Baptism; for, if Christ hath no where required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants, then the Baptism of Infants is not according to the commission of our Lord Jesus Christ: but Christ hath no where required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants: therefore the Baptism of Infants is not according to the commission of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Chand. If you mean by requiring; Christ expressly requiring in so many words, that Infants shall be baptized, then I deny the consequence; but if you mean, that by genuine consequence it cannot be drawn from Scripture, I deny your Minor.

Russel. (For the Minor) if Christ hath any where required any of his Ministers to baptize Infants, then it is somewhere so Recorded: but it is not in Scripture so Recorded: therefore, &c.

Chand. If you mean still, it is not so by good consequence, I deny your Minor. *Russel.*

Russel. If it be somewhere so Recorded, then Mr. *Chandler*, *Leigh*, &c. or some one or other may shew it; but neither they, nor any other, is able to shew it: therefore, &c.

Chand. I deny the Minor.

Russel. It is a universal Negative, you must prove it: I appeal to the Moderator.

Robinson Mod. This ought not to be put upon the Respondent; you must prove it still: for, suppose that neither Mr. *Chandler* nor Mr. *Leigh* can give an Instance, do you prove that none other can?

Russel. I am sure, according to the Rules of Dispute, Mr. *Chandler* must prove the Negative.

Leigh. Here is a Gentleman understands the Rules of Disputation: I desire, Sir, (speaking to Dr. *Smith*, then present) you would declare, who is to prove.

Dr. *Smith.* According to the Rules of Disputation, *Negantis non est probare*, i. e. The denyer is not to prove, and therefore not Mr. *Chandler*.

Upon which, together with Dr. *Russel's* taking no notice of good consequences, (without which but few Points can be cleared) he proceeds to another Argument.

Russel. Arg. 2. If infants are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men, then they cannot possibly be the Subjects of Baptism intended in Christ's Commission; but they are not capable of being made Disciples by the Ministry of men, therefore &c.

Chandler. If you mean by Disciples actual and compleat Ones, I deny your Major: but if you mean incompleat Disciples, such as are entred into a School

School in order to be instructed, and given up in order to learn there, then I deny your Minor.

'Hereafter several Shufflings of the Dr. to avoid (or else to take no notice of) the distinction, between compleat and incompleat Disciples. Mr. Leigh saith.

Leigh. Answer directly to the distinction given; and therefore either prove that Infants are not incompleat Disciples; or that they are not to be baptized because incompleat: that is, not capable of Instruction by the Ministry of Men.

But he waving to take any notice of the distinction, is forced to come up with a third Argument.

Russel. Arg. 3. If the Apostle *Paul* did declare all the Council of God, and kept back nothing that was profitable for the Church of God, and yet did never declare the Baptism of Infants to be an Institution of Christ, then Infant-Baptism is not according to the Commission of our Lord Jesus Christ: but that Apostle did declare all the council of God, and kept back nothing, &c. and yet did never declare the Baptism of Infants, &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. I deny (part of your Minor) prove that the Apostle *Paul* never did declare the Baptism of Infants.

Russel. If the Apostle *Paul* hath so declared it, then it is somewhere to be found in the Writings of the New Testament: but it is no where there to be found. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. I deny the consequence of the Major, for *Paul* might declare it, although the New Testament should not discover that he did; what is urged (*Acts* 20. v. 20. 27.) of *Paul's* keeping back nothing profitable, but declaring the whole council of God,

God, was spoken to the Church of *Ephesus*, where he preached for the space of two Years : and we cannot suppose that two Years Declaration of the will of God, can be expressly set down in that short Epistle to the *Ephesians*, which consists but of 6 Chapters; and therefore unless you prove that he never declared it, you prove nothing to the purpose : for (I say) tho' *Paul* did not shun to declare the whole counsel of God, and did not declare Infant-baptism in his Epistle to the Church of *Ephesus*; therefore he did not declare it in his Sermons to them, is what is to be proved.

By the way we may note, that (in *Ephes.* 4. 5. one Baptism is mentioned, to which they were called : and surely there were some Infants amongst them.

'The Apostle wrote his Epistle to the *Ephesians* when at *Rome*, and therein does not so much appeal to present Declarations as to what had formerly been taught them : and so likewise these words, *have Kept*, and *have Declared*, refer to the time past, and not to what was after in that Epistle expressed.

'Here again, Dr. *Russel* would have put off the Opponency to the Respondent, but being not admitted (as by the Rules of Disputation it ought not) he proceeds to a Fourth Argument.

Russel. Arg. 4. Christ's commission doth shew who are to be baptized : but it doth not shew that Infants are to be baptized : therefore Infants are not to be baptized according to Christ's commission.

Chand. I deny your Minor ; and assert, that Infants are included in the words [*All Nations.*]

Russel. If those whom Christ hath commanded to be baptized must be Disciples, then Infants are not

not included in this commission: but those whom Christ hath commanded, &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. I deny the Consequence, Since there is no necessity, that all included in this commission, should be Disciples in the fullest and compleatest Sense.

Russel. All those that are required to be baptized by Christ's commission are Disciples, but Infants are not capable of being Disciples. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. I deny the whole Argument, first the Major.

Russel. No other are expressed in the commission besides Disciples.

Leigh. But they are implied.

Russel. If our Lord requires none to be baptized by the Commission, but such as he commands to be made Disciples before he commands them to be baptized, then all that are required to be baptized are Disciples: but our Lord requires none to be baptized, &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. I deny the Minor.

'Here Dr. *Russel* read the commission (*Math.* 28. '18. 19. 20.) and was entring into a large Har-
'rangue upon it; but being told, it was not a Ser-
'mon upon the commission, but an Argument from
'it, that was expected; He after much adoe thus
proceeds.

Russel. If there be an exprefs command for baptizing some Persons in Christ's commission and there be no exprefs command, either there or else-where in the holy Scripture for baptizing of Infants; then the Baptism of Infants is not contained in this commission: but there is an exprefs command, &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh.

Leigh. Good consequence is allowed, *All Nations*, include Infants.

Chand. We deny the Consequence of the Major and the Minor both.

‘ Here Dr *Russel*, after many words to little purpose, being urged to prove the Consequence of the ‘ Major, thus proceeded.

Russel. If no Person be to be baptized, but what is expressly required to be so by Christ’s commission then the consequence of the Major is true, [*viz.* That the Baptism of Infants is not contained in the commission] but no Person is to be baptized, but. &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. I deny the Minor.

Russel. If the words of the commission be an express Command to the Apostles of our Lord, to direct them whom they should baptize, then no Person is to be baptized, but who is expressly required to be so by Christ’s commission ; but the words of the commission are, &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh We grant they are a Command, but deny that all the Subjects of it are expressed, some are taken in by good consequence.

Russel. If Christ commanded his Apostles to baptize such as believe and are made Disciples, then such are to be baptized : but, &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. The consequence of the Major ought to have been [*Then such Only* are to be baptized] : or it proves nothing against us ; and then we deny it.

Williams. If Believers are only included in the commission, then none, &c. but else are, &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. I deny your Minor.

Williams. Mark 16. 16. *He that believeth and is baptized, &c. therefore Believers only to be baptized.*

Leigh. If previous actual believing be necessary to Baptism, much more to Salvation, and then no Infant can be saved ; for it follows, *he that believeth not shall be damned.*

Russel. We believe them rather all saved ; nor can you prove the contrary.

Leigh. We know your Opinion in that point.

Williams. If Believers are the only Subjects of Baptism in the commission, then Infants are not ; but, &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. I deny your minor, others are included in [All Nations]

Williams. It is *All Nations* disciplined.

Leigh. I deny it.

Williams. *Go disciple unto me all nations, baptizing them*—the word *Them*, is relative to *All Nations* disciplined—If then, none but Believers, and such as are taught, be in the Commission, Infants are not ; but none but Believers, &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. I deny the minor.

Williams. If Infants are incapable of being taught, or learning Jesus Christ, they are incapable of being made Disciples ; but Infants, &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. I deny the consequence of the major.

Williams. If to be a Disciple of Christ, is to be a Scholar ; then Infants that are incapable of learning Christ can be no Disciples ; but to be, &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. I deny the consequence of the major.

Willi-

Williams. Infants are not capable of learning Christ, therefore no Scholars.

Leigh. A Child resigned by his Parents, and accepted by the Master, is an *Incomplete Scholar*, tho' he hath learned nothing.

Williams. If he that by his own consent hath been in Christ's School, must give Evidence of his being a Scholar of Christ, by his having actually learned, before he be baptized; then Infants must not be baptized: but he, &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. I deny your Consequence.

'*Mr. Williams* here drops the Proof of the consequence, and only prove the antecedent by the instance of the *Eunuch*, of whom *Philip* enquired, whether he did believe, that he might be baptized; and quotes *Erasmus* rendring the words, [*when they have learned Dip them*]. And tho' he represents him as a great Scholar in his day, proved himself but a very poor one in our days, by asserting, that *Erasmus* wrote in English. Nor did the Doctor betray much more Learning than his fellow Champion, by imputing the peoples Laughter at the old Gentleman's ignorance)

The People could not but laugh to hear, that *Erasmus* wrote in English.

'to his bare naming *E R A S M U S*.

'But *Mr. Leigh* (after having shown, that the *Eunuch* being an adult Person, was dealt with as such; and being a Profelyte to the Jewish Law*, his Children had he had any, would have been Members of

generation; but *Princes*, *Minister Regius*, a great Officer.

* Either adopted, as he might have been, or else natural; for, (by the Decret. leave) *ἐκ γένου*, does not always signify *Exire*, one incapacitated for ge-



‘ the Church of God, as much as those of natural
 ‘ Jews) puts these Questions : *Whether, had he had*
 ‘ *a Child with him, he would have been denied Baptism,*
 ‘ *and shut out of visible Church-membership, which he*
 ‘ *had before enjoyed. And, Whether his Parents Faith*
 ‘ *would have deprived him of Church-membership?*

To which, since we don’t find the Anabaptists did, we would desire them, at their leisure, to return an Answer; and give the World some account how it came to pass, that the Jews, who were so jealous of their Priviledges, of being by their birth-right God’s peculiar People, made no Complaint of, nor cast any Reproach on, the Christian Religion, as excluding their Children from being what they were before, *Visible Members of the Church of God.*

Williams. If the Administrator must have an account of the Subject’s Learning before he be baptized, then infants are not the Subjects of Baptism; but the Administrator must, &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. I deny your minor.

Will. I’ll prove it first by that of *Philip : If thou be-*
lievest with all thine Heart

True of all Persons adult,
 not Baptized in Infancy. *thou may’st : The con-*
trary whereof is, If thou
do’st not, thou may’st not : And Math. 28. Go teach
all Nations, baptizing them : which word is rela-
 tive to *all Nations disciplined.* They must have an
 account whether Disciplined or not. This is the An-
 tecedent.

Leigh. What, all Nations?

Williams. Nay, all Nations disciplined.

Leigh. So you say, but prove it --- perhaps you
 think that all Nations cannot be the Antecedent to
 them,

them, because τὰ ἑὸν is the *neuter* gender, and αὐτὸς is the *masculine*.

Russel. Yes, αὐτὸς is of the *masculine* gender, and μαθητεύσατε is of the *masculine* gender, and agrees with αὐτὸς.

Robins. I thought μαθητεύσατε had been a Verb.

Russel. I say αὐτὸς is of the *masculine* gender, and Well done Doctor, spoke like a Coffee-Man; stand to't.
μαθητεύσατε is of the same gender, and agrees with αὐτὸς.

Leigh. I suppose Mr. *Russel* thinks he is got amongst his *Hebrew* Verbs; but though τὰ ἑὸν be of the *neuter* gender, and αὐτὸς of the *masculine*, yet they agree by a *Synthesis*.

Williams. Infants are not capable of denying themselves, therefore they cannot be Christ's Disciples.

Leigh. This purely refers to the Adult.

Russel. What's all this? Infants are not at all concern'd in the commission, because they cannot perform the Prerequisites, *viz.* Faith and Repentance.

Williams. If the Essence of Faith consists in the Acts of the Understanding and Will, then Infants can't be Disciples: but the, &c. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. I deny the Sequel of the Major.

Williams. A Disciple and a Believer is the same thing. Therefore, &c.

Leigh. I distinguish, 'tis not universally true, they are not in all respects the same thing.

Williams. A Disciple, according to Christ's commission, is a Believer; but Infants cannot be Believers. Therefore, &c.

Leigh.

Leigh. 'Tis not universally true; for Infants may be Disciples in an imperfect sense, though not actual Believers --- Why can't they believe in Christ imputatively, as well as come to Christ, when brought in the Arms of other Persons. Actually they can't believe, but Imputatively they may.

Williams. The Parents Faith is not imputed to the child.

Leigh. In God's Court it may not, but in the Judgment of the Church it may.

Williams. No one is a Disciple of *Jesus Christ*, until he hath learn'd *Christ*.

Leigh. Do we send children to School because they have Learn'd, or that they may Learn.

Russel. I think we should now see, whether we can possibly, by force of Argument, bring you to give an instance.

Arg. 5. If the Apostles did never Baptize any Infants, then the Baptism of Infants is not according to our Lord's commission: but, &c. Therefore, &c.

Chand I deny the minor.

Russel. If the Apostles did baptize any Infants, 'tis somewhere recorded in the New Testament; but 'tis not recorded, &c. Therefore.

Leigh. I deny your major: it may not be recorded, and yet the Apostles might baptize Infants. Pray give one instance of a child of believing Parents baptised when adult

Russel. That's not our Business.

Leigh.

Leigh. 'Tis the custom of these men to baptize grown Persons, though baptised before: They talk much of our having no Scripture for *our* Practice, whereas they pretend they have abundance for *theirs*: Let them give one instance of their Practice, *viz.* Of a Person, born of believing Parents, baptized at Age, and I'll give up the Cause. From the death of *Christ*, to that of *St. John*, was (by computation) 60 Years, in which time many thousands of children must have been born of believing Parents; now we challenge them to give an instance of one such baptized when Adult.

Russel. *Constantine the Great* was Born of a believing Parent.

Leigh. That's no Scripture instance.

His Father was a Pagan, and 'tis questionable whether his Mother was a Christian in his Infancy.

Russel. " Here *Dr.*
" *Russel* saith (to what purpose we cannot imagine) that for many years " the Lord's Supper was given to Infants.

Leigh. Was it? Then (*ad hominem*) they were first baptized.

Williams. Christ was the Son of a Believer, yet baptized at Age

Leigh. That was before the commission, which we are now upon.

Russel. 'Tis a right instance.

Robins. 'Tis nothing to the purpose; the Virgin *Mary* was undoubtedly a believing Member of the Jewish Church, but not properly a christian, since Christianity, as distinguished from *Judaism*, had not then a being: nor was Baptism instituted by our Lord.

Williams.

Williams. I demand an instance of an Infant baptized.

[*] " And we think Mr. Leigh well might, because
 " Infants of Believers, having
 " been always Members of the
 " Visible Church, by God's
 " own appointment, (who still
 " includes Children with their
 " Parents in His Promises to
 " the Obedient, and Threats
 " against the Disobedient) and
 " recognized as such in their
 " Circumcision; no Authority
 " less than that which bestow-
 " ed on them that Priviledg,
 " can deprive them of it. But
 " the Excluding them from
 " Baptism, is a depriving them
 " of this Priviledge, (since
 " there's now no other Ordi-
 " nance for the recognizing
 " Persons as Visible Members
 " of the Church of God) and
 " therefore 'tis not to be done
 " without God's express
 " Authority.

able to the Holy Scriptures.

Chand. Arg. 1. Visible Church Members ought to be Baptized; but some Infants are Visible Church-Members. Therefore, &c.

Russel. I deny the major.

Chand. If there be no Precept nor Example in all the Word of God; since Christ ordained Baptism, that makes any other Ordinance the visible Means of entering a Person into the visible Church, then visible Members ought to be Baptized; but there is no, &c. Therefore, &c.

Russel.

Leigh. I demand an
 [*] express Prohibition.

Williams. I demand an express Prohibition of Cream, Salt, Spittle.

Leigh. The case is not parallel, for (1.) we are only discoursing of the Subjects of Baptism. (2.) We say Infants are included in the words [all Nations], but Salt, Cream, &c are not in [Disciple] or [Baptize].

Robertson. What need of an instance, when we have a rule? Mr. Chandler, you may now, if you please, take the part of an Opponent, and prove our Practice to be agree-

Russel. That is, because they *are* Members, therefore they are to be *made* Members.

Leigh. No, because they *are* Members, they ought to be solemnly *recognized* as Members.

Williams. I deny Infants to be visible Members.

Leigh. I'll prove some are, *Mat. 19. 14. Suffer little Children to, &c. for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.* Hence I argue, Those that belongs to the Kingdom of Heaven, *i. e. the Church Militant on Earth*, are visible Church Members : But some Infants, &c. Therefore, &c.

Williams. I deny the Minor.

Leigh. The [Kingdom of Heaven] cannot be taken otherwise, to make good Sense of the Text ; This I prove by an Induction : The [Kingdom of Heaven] signifies either the *Laws and Promises* of the Kingdom ; or the *Graces* by which we observe those Laws, and believe those Promises ; or the *Kingdom of Glory*, or the *Church Militant* : But it can't signify here either of the former, therefore it must the last.

Williams. I say it signifies the Kingdom of *Glory*.

Leigh. 'Tis Nonsense so to understand the words, for then the *Kingdom of Glory* must, in part, consist of such poor little weak things as Infants ; whereas all are perfect in the Kingdom of *Glory*.

Williams. I deny that the visible Church doth in part consist of Infants : If they are neither Members of the Universal Church, nor of any particular Church, then the Church doth not consist in part of these. But, &c. Therefore, &c.

Here Mr. Williams turns Opponent against all Rules of Disputation.

Leigh. Now you relinquish my Medium ; but if they are Members of the Church at all, they are Members of the universal Church visible : but, &c. therefore.

Williams. I deny the minor, *that they are visible Members of the Church.*

Leigh. I prove they are, *Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.* Now if the *Kingdom of Heaven* here signifies
C neither

neither the *Laws*, nor *Promises*, nor *Graces*, nor *Christ's* Management of the Kingdom, nor the *Glory of Heaven*, nor the *Subjects of Glory*, then it must signify the *Church Militant* here on Earth; but it signifies neither of the former, therefore the last.

Russel. I deny your minor.

Leigh. I prove it by an induction; of such little Children are the *Laws* and *Promises*; of such are the *Graces*; of such is the Management of *Christ's* Kingdom; of such is the *Happiness* or *Subjects* of the Kingdom of *Glory*: Now, is there any Sense in all this?

Russel. The Text you mention hath neither the word Baptism, nor the [*] Commission of our Lord in it.

[*] Since Dr. *Russel* so frequently insists on the Commission, we would by the by, ask him these Questions, and beg his Answer, viz. Whether if our Lord had delivered the Commission in these words, *Go, Disciple all Nations, Circumcising them in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, the Children of Disciple Nations would not have been, by it, required to be Circumcised? And whether the Matter of the Ordinance only, (not the design, end, signification of it) being changed, Infants are not concern'd in Baptize as well as they would have been in Circumcise? If not, for what Reason?

Leigh. It must not, it seems, be allowed us to prove, from any Text of Scripture, the right of Infants to Baptism, unless we find it in the close of the Evangelists, or unless the word Baptism be found in it.

Robertson. They are not oblig'd to have Baptism or the Commission in the conclusion of every Syllogism: They had it in the first. Their Argument ran thus: Members of the Church Militant are to be Baptized, but such are some Infants; Therefore, &c. you denied the minor; the forementioned Text was brought to prove it, I suppose, to the satisfaction of the Company. If you will deny the major, they are doubtless ready to prove it.

Here Mr. Williams turns Opponent, and Argues thus.

Williams. If Church Members have been denied Baptism, then Church Membership is not the Ground of Baptism, but, &c. therefore, &c.

Leigh. I deny the minor.

Williams. If Church Members were denied Baptism by John, then Church Membership is not the Ground of Baptism, but, &c. therefore, &c.

Leigh. I deny the minor.

Williams. John deny'd to Baptize the Sadduces, &c.

Leigh. I deny that they were Church Members *de jure*, their being a Generation of Vipers proves them not to be so.

Williams. If our Lord did Disciple such as were Church Members before they were Baptized, then Church Membership is not the Ground of Baptism: But, &c. therefore, &c.

Leigh. I distinguish between the Jewish and the Christian Church, and between Infant Church Members, and Adult ones. 'Tis Christian Church Membership is a Ground of Baptism.

Here Mr. Sharp, the Anabaptist Moderator, urgeth, that Church Members are to be Excommunicated on their Apostacy, but such as were admitted into Church Membership in their Infancy, were not to be Excommunicated upon their Apostacy. To which Mr. Leigh reply'd, That they were not speaking about the Management of Church Members, but the Persons that were to be esteemed such, &c.

Nothing more followed but a nauseous Repetition of what had been often urg'd, and as often answer'd, (except Dr. Russel's comparing Infants, even of Believers, to Beasts of the Field. Which Mr. Leigh answer'd, by appealing to all present, whether Dogs or Pigs may as properly be sent to School, and are as capable of the Parents resignation, or the Masters acceptance, as Infants are) till they proceeded to

Chand. Arg. 2. If some Infants be Disciples of Christ, then, according to the Commillion, some Infants

are to be Baptized; but some Infants are, &c. Therefore, &c.

Russel. I deny the minor.

Chand. Those whom the Holy Ghost calls Disciples, are Disciples: But the Holy Ghost calls some Infants Disciples. Therefore, &c.

Russel. I deny the minor.

Chand. 15. *Acts* 20. Why tempt you God to put a Yoke upon the Necks of the Disciples: now those on whom this Yoke was attempted to be laid, were called Disciples, but 'twas attempted to be laid on Infants. Therefore, &c.

Russel. The Text proves no such matter.

Chand. If they are called Disciples, who were to be Circumcised after the manner of *Moses*, then Infants are called Disciples: But, &c. Therefore, &c.

Russel. They were the Gentile Believers that were called Disciples.

Chand. All are so, on whom the Yoke of Circumcision was laid, which neither they nor their Fathers were able to bear.

Russel. Infants could bear the Yoke of Circumcision.

Chand. The Holy Ghost saith expressly, *they could not*.

Williams. If Circumcision did bind to keep the whole Law, then that (*viz.* the whole Law) was the Yoke, (and not Circumcision) which they were not able to bear, but so it was, *Gal.* 5. 3.

Leigh. Thus far I think you in the right, that the whole Ceremonial Law is the Yoke: But Circumcision must not be left out, which is a prime and most painful part of it, as you would, and thereby leave out Infants, whom those Judaizing Christians advised to be Circumcised.

Robins. Mr. Chandler, pray proceed to the 2d Question.

Chand. Quest. 2d. Whether according to the Commission of our Lord, Baptism be to be administer'd by Dipping, Plunging, or Overwhelming only, and not otherwise,
Dr.

Dr. Russel began to Argue, but not concluding his Argument with the Words of the Question, the Moderator interrupted him; telling him, That he Must and Should do so, before the Respondent should take notice of his Argument.

Dr. Russel was somewhat offended at the words, Must and Shall; but at length proceeded thus:

Russel. If that baptism which is appointed by Christ, and doth properly set forth his Burial and Resurrection, is the only right way of baptizing, then it must be performed by Dipping, Plunging, &c. only: But that Baptism, &c. is the only right way, &c. Therefore, &c.

Chand. I deny the consequence of the Major first, and then the Minor. You are to prove, that because Baptism is significant of the Burial and Resurrection of Christ, it must be by Dipping, Plunging, only.

Russel. If this was the only way practiced in those times, it must be by Dipping only.

" This is not proving the consequence, which Mr. Chandler denied, but flying to a second Argument drawn from Primitive Practice.

Chand. I deny the Minor.

Russel. If there be any other way, shew it.

Chand. I can shew it. The word signifies, to Wash; it's very probable, that many had only Water poured on them

Leigh. We argue on a Probability; it might be otherwise than by Dipping; therefore there's no necessity of Dipping. Prove, that the Texts wherein you render Baptism by Dipping, do necessarily signify Dipping.

Russel. 1 Mark 9. The Greek Particle *eis*, signifies [*into*] so that the words ought to be rendred, He was Dipped of John into Jordan; since to say, He was Washed of John into Jordan, is Nonsense.

Leigh. The Particle *eis* signifies [*in*], as well as [*into*], particularly in this place; which is rightly rendred, Baptized, or Washed in Jordan.

Russel. I deny that the Particle *eis* signifies [*in*], but [*into*], 1 Tim. I. 19. *eis* τῷ * κόσμῳ, into the World; and *eis*, &c. into * False Greek.

the

the Synagogue : So here, † ἐῖς τὸν Ἰωάννην † *Worse and worse.*

Leigh. I'll produce thrice the number of Places to prove it signifies [*in*] : and he was about to do it, but had no room for it.

Chand. We'll prove that βαπτίζω, signifies [*to Wash*] frequently in Scripture.

Russel. All *Lexicographers* tell us, the Primary Signification of βαπτίζω, is to Plunge.

Leigh. The word is taken otherwise in Scripture, which is enough : tho' we should grant what you say, (as we do not) as to its Primary Signification. To know the Sense of this word in this Ordinance, we must consider how 'tis taken in other places, where this Ordinance is not intended. Now produce one such place, where the word βαπτίζω, signifies *Necessarily to Dip*.

* 'Tis not so
in the Text. *Russel.* There's no need of that. But
* Philip put the *Eunuch* under the Water.

Leigh. I deny the word to signify any where [*to put under the Water*] ; and can bring you several places, in which it cannot signify to Dip : as 7. *Mark* 4. *Except they wash* (ἐὰν μὲ βαπτίσωσιν) *they eat not*. As also, where mention is made of baptizing Beds and Tables, i. e. Washing them, by pouring Water on them ; not Plunging them under Water. Now I defy you to produce one place, in which it must necessarily signify, to Dip or Plunge.

Russel. Dr. *Russ* urged *Mat.* 3. 6. *They were Baptized*, i. e. *Dipp'd* ; which Interpretation he endeavoured to confirm by the Authority of Dr. *Hammond*, the *Assembly's*, and the *Dutch Annotations* ; but the Books were not at hand ; or if they had been, that was no Proof.

Leigh. Mr. *Leigh* declared farther, their practice, viz. Of *Washing* or *Spinking*, was grounded on what *Christ* quotes, *I will have Mercy and not sanctify* ; shews, that Plunging in so cold a Country as Ours, might endanger Life or Health, and was therefore contrary to Charity : That a Moral Precept would take place of a Ritual,

al, when opposite; especially when the Ritual that's opposed to it is not evident.

Russel. Dr. *Russel* was about to read several Quotations he had collected out of Dr. *Hammond*, Assemb. Annotations, *Pool*, which the People refused to hear; and not offering any Scripture, (as he was called on to do) to prove that βαπτισμα, necessarily signified to *Dip*.

The Moderator, after having briefly summ'd up what was said on this last Question, concluded the whole Dispute with these Words to the People.

And now, upon the whole, we are willing to refer all to your own Judgments; whether you will be perswaded to account your own Baptism a Nullity, because it hath not been Administred in the way of these Persons. If you can, without any solid Reason, or without so much as the Evidence of one single Text of Scripture, be satisfied; you may then take what our Adversaries have said for Satisfaction: But since it hath been fully proved, that Christ hath only required that Persons be solemnly Entered in his Church, by *Baptizing or Washing, in the Name of the Father, Son, and Spirit*; and hath not Determined, so far as doth appear, whether this *Washing* shall be performed this way, or that. We are willing (I say) to refer it to the Judgment of you all, Whether our Way of Administration be not the most Commodious,

F I N I S.

Advertisement.

TH E Reader is desired to observe,
That Collonel *Gibson* sent a Letter
to the Right Reverend the Bishop of *Salisbury*,
relating to this Disputation; wherein he
says, the *Presbyterians* had as much the Bet-
ter, as could be desired.
